UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,994	06/14/2001	Minoru Teshigawara	862.C2266	4699
	7590 09/26/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFEI	LLER PLAZA	HOFFMAN, BRANDON S		
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		09/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

A

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/879,994	TESHIGAWARA, MINORU			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Brandon S. Hoffman	2136			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 July 2007</u> .					
	·				
· —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1,3,5-17,19 and 21-23 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5-17,19 and 21-23</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
,	•				
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)					

Art Unit: 2136

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Claims 1, 3, 5-17, 19, and 21-23 are pending in this office action.
- 2. Applicant's arguments, filed July 23, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. <u>Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 16, 17, 19, and 21-23</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Usami et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,814) in view of <u>Davis</u> (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,584).

Regarding <u>claims 1, 17, and 22, Usami et al.</u> teaches and image processing apparatus/method/program comprising:

 Additional information generating means for generating additional information (fig. 11, ref. num 62); and

Art Unit: 2136

 Adding means for repeatedly adding the additional information to image data to generate information-added data so as to make it difficult to visually identify the additional information (fig. 11, ref. num 63 and col. 20, lines 10-29).

Usami et al. does not teach encrypting means for encrypting the information-added data to make it difficult to detect a position where the additional information is added and for outputting the encrypted information-added data to an image forming apparatus, wherein said encrypting means encrypts the information-added data by randomly arranging the additional information as well as the image data.

<u>Davis</u> teaches encrypting means for encrypting the information-added data to make it difficult to detect a position where the additional information is added and for outputting the encrypted information-added data to an image forming apparatus (fig. 2), wherein said encrypting means encrypts the information-added data by randomly arranging the additional information as well as the image data (col. 3, lines 50-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine encrypting information-added data in a position where it is difficult to detect, as taught by <u>Davis</u>, with the system/method/program of <u>Usami et al.</u> It would have been obvious for such modifications because the confusion of the location of the embedded data provides authentication (see abstract of Davis).

Art Unit: 2136

Regarding <u>claim 3</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches wherein said encrypting means adds key information for specifying an encryption method to the encrypted information-added data (see col. 1, lines 16-21 of Usami et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 5</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches wherein said encrypting means arranges the information-added data on the basis of a predetermined random pattern (see col. 2, lines 22-34 of Usami et al).

Regarding <u>claim 6</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches wherein the key information is information for specifying the random pattern (see col. 2, lines 22-34 of Usami et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 7</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches transmitting means for transmitting the image data encrypted by said encrypting means to a connected image forming apparatus (see fig. 5 of Usami et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 8</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches wherein the additional information includes first information for specifying the image forming apparatus (see col. 12, lines 39-49 of Usami et al.).

Art Unit: 2136

Usami et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Usami et al. as modified by Davis teaches wherein the first information is notified from the image forming apparatus (see col. 12, lines 39-49 of

Regarding <u>claim 10</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches wherein the additional information includes second information associated with a processing environment for the image data (see col. 4, lines 31-46 of Usami et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 11</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches wherein the second information includes information for specifying the image processing apparatus (see col. 4, lines 31-46 of Usami et al.).

Regarding claim 16, Usami et al. as modified by Davis teaches wherein the image data is color image data made of a plurality of color components, and said adding means adds the additional information to data of a predetermined color component of the color image data (see col. 2, lines 40-53, 66-67 and col. 3, lines 1-20 of Usami et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 19</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> teaches an image processing system having an image processing apparatus connected to an image forming apparatus (fig. 5 and col. 1, lines 16-20),

Said image processing apparatus including

Art Unit: 2136

- Additional information generating means for generating additional information (fig. 11, ref. num 62);
- Adding means for repeatedly adding the additional information to image data to generate information-added data so as to make it difficult to visually identify the additional information (fig. 11, ref. num 63);
- Transmitting means for transmitting the encrypted image data to said image forming apparatus (fig. 5); and
 Said image forming apparatus including
- Receiving means for receiving the encrypted data transmitted from said image processing apparatus (fig. 12, ref. num 51) and
- Image forming means for forming a visible image on the basis of the decrypted information-added data (fig. 12, ref. num 65 and col. 16, lines 18-30).

Usami et al. does not teach encrypting means for encrypting the information-added data to make it difficult to detect a position where the additional information is added or decrypting means for obtaining the information-added data by decrypting the received encrypted data, wherein said encrypting means encrypts the information-added data by randomly arranging the additional information as well as the image data.

<u>Davis</u> teaches encrypting means for encrypting the information-added data to make it difficult to detect a position where the additional information is added and

Art Unit: 2136

(col. 3, lines 50-67).

decrypting means for obtaining the information-added data by decrypting the received encrypted data (fig. 2), wherein said encrypting means encrypts the information-added data by randomly arranging the additional information as well as the image data

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine encrypting information-added data in a position where it is difficult to detect and decrypting the encrypted information, as taught by <u>Davis</u>, with the system of <u>Usami et al.</u> It would have been obvious for such modifications because the confusion of the location of the embedded data provides authentication (see abstract of Davis).

Regarding claim 21, Usami et al. as modified by Davis teaches wherein

- Said encrypting means adds key information for specifying an encryption method to the encrypted information-added data (see col. 1, lines 16-21 of Usami et al);
 and
- Said decrypting means decrypts the encrypted data on the basis of the key information added by said encrypting means (see col. 16, lines 18-30 of Usami et al.).

Regarding <u>claim 23</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teaches a storage medium storing the program defined in claim 22 (see fig. 1 of Usami et al.).

Art Unit: 2136

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Usami et al. (USPN '814) and Davis (USPN '941) in view of Ito et al. (US 2001/0013097

A1).

Regarding <u>claim 12</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teach all the limitations for the following limitation. <u>Ito et al.</u> teaches wherein the information for specifying the image processing apparatus includes a network ID of the image processing apparatus (paragraph 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of <u>Ito et al.</u> within the system of <u>Usami et al./Davis</u> because a network ID is essential for the image processing apparatus to be identifiable and hence connected to a network.

Regarding <u>claim 13</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teach all the limitations except for the following limitation. <u>Ito et al.</u> teaches wherein the network ID is acquired in accordance with a type of network to which the image processing apparatus is connected (paragraph 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of <u>Ito et al.</u> within the system of <u>Usami et al./Davis</u>

Art Unit: 2136

because a network ID is essential for the image processing apparatus to be identifiable and hence connected to a network.

Regarding <u>claim 14</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teach all the limitations except for the following limitation. <u>Ito et al.</u> teaches wherein the information for specifying the image processing apparatus includes a user ID of the image processing apparatus (paragraph 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of <u>Ito et al.</u> within the system of <u>Usami et al./Davis</u> because a network ID is essential for the image processing apparatus to be identifiable and hence connected to a network.

Regarding <u>claim 15</u>, <u>Usami et al.</u> as modified by <u>Davis</u> teach all the limitations except for the following limitation. <u>Ito et al.</u> teaches wherein the second information includes processing date information of the image data (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of <u>Ito et al.</u> within the system of <u>Usami et al./Davis</u> because the processing date information will enable ID of the embedded supplemental information to be unique and hence more secure.

Art Unit: 2136

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues that the combination of references fails to teach encrypting the information-added data by randomly arranging the additional information as well as the image data (page 10).

Regarding applicant's argument, examiner disagrees. Davis teaches randomly arranging additional information (fig. 2, RANDOM DATA) as well as the image data (fig. 2, SECRET IDENTIFIER) in a process to encrypt (scramble) the data.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2136

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon Hoffman/

ВН

NASSER MOAZZAMI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

9,21,07